

Ref: 489/01  
Date: 28<sup>th</sup> November 2024

## **Whinney Close Farm, Kirkheaton**

### **Comparative Volume and Area Analysis**



The purpose of this statement is to set out a comparison of the footprint and volume of the existing building at the above site in relation to that for the proposed replacement dwelling. Areas and volumes will be provided for the existing building, the existing building assuming Permitted Development (PD) rights (Class A) can be constructed without a planning application, and for the proposed building.

#### **Volume of the existing building**

House: 1,292m<sup>3</sup>

Garage: 113m<sup>3</sup>

Outbuilding: 28m<sup>3</sup>

Total existing volume: 1,433m<sup>3</sup>

#### **Volume of the existing building with PD Rights**

Side extension to west (quarter width of house): 115.5m<sup>3</sup>

Side extension to east (half width of house): 308m<sup>3</sup>

Rear extension (8m) for full width of house: 758.3m<sup>3</sup>

Garden Building: 771.4m<sup>3</sup>

Total volume of PD extensions: 1,953m<sup>3</sup>

Total existing volume plus PD extensions: 3,436m<sup>3</sup>

#### **Volume of the proposed building**

House: 2,815m<sup>3</sup>

#### **Comparison of existing and proposed building volume**

% Increase in volume from existing to proposed: 96% larger

% Decrease in volume from existing (with PD extensions) to proposed: 18% smaller

Both figures include reduction for existing outbuilding to be demolished

### **The Footprint of the existing building**

House: 225.1m<sup>2</sup>

Garage: 51.6m<sup>2</sup>

Outbuilding: 16.2m<sup>2</sup>

Total footprint of existing buildings: 292.9m<sup>2</sup>

### **Footprint of the existing building with PD Rights**

Side extension to west (quarter width of house): 42.8m<sup>2</sup>

Side extension to east (half width of house): 85.6m<sup>2</sup>

Rear extension (8m) for full width of house: 198.1m<sup>2</sup>

Garden Building: 237.8m<sup>2</sup>

Total footprint of PD extensions: 564.3m<sup>2</sup>

Total existing footprint plus PD extensions: 841.0m<sup>2</sup> (including reduction for existing outbuilding to be demolished)

### **Footprint of the proposed building**

House: 352.8m<sup>2</sup>

### **Comparison of existing and proposed building footprint**

% Increase in footprint from existing to proposed: 20% larger

% increase in footprint from existing to existing with PD extensions: 92% larger

% Decrease in footprint from existing with PD extensions to proposed: 58% smaller

The purpose of including this calculation is that it best demonstrates the impact of the sprawl of built form. This is significant as it is clear that the greatest impact upon the green belt is through permitted development extensions to the existing building. This results in a proposal that almost doubles the footprint and which has a far greater physical impact upon green belt than the proposed replacement dwelling.

### **Comparison of existing and proposed building dimensions**

Length of existing house and garage: 33.3m

Length of existing house with PD side extensions: 42.9m

Width of existing house: 9.3m (18.9m including garage)

Width of existing house with PD 8m rear extension: 19.2m

Height of proposed ridge above existing ridge: 0.6m (8.5% taller than existing)

Length of proposed house: 28m (16% less than existing and 34% less than existing with PD side extensions)

Width of proposed house: 13.2m (40% greater than existing and 50% less than existing including garage and 32% less than existing with PD rear extension)

These dimensions clearly show that the size of the proposed house is broadly similar to the existing in terms of overall dimensions but crucially that it is significantly less wide and less deep than the existing house with Permitted Development extensions to the sides and rear. The council has confirmed the extent of extensions which are allowed under permitted development regulations and these have been implemented. The proposed house is higher than the existing by 0.6m although this is viewed against a wooded backdrop that mitigates the proposed increase as noted in the Landscape Visual Appraisal.

What should be borne in mind in assessing this application is that nearby applications for replacement dwellings have been permitted with increases in volume of between 20% (2008/62/94060/W2) to 76% (2005/62/94284). The new houses are in the immediate vicinity of this application site and are of a substantial nature.

In reviewing the above applications, it is clear they allowed for substantial buildings by utilising volumes of large temporary buildings as a fallback position. In the case of application 2007/62/93678/W2, which was granted and implemented for the house immediately to the north of Whinney Close Farm, a temporary steel shed of 3,122m<sup>3</sup> was included in the proposal. The demolished farmhouse, which was originally 1,073m<sup>3</sup>, was replaced with a new dwelling of 2,490m<sup>3</sup>. **This planning permission represents a 125% increase in volume from the original building.** This application is for a significantly reduced footprint and a reduced volume when compared to the Permitted Development fallback position.

The potential impact of development on the openness cannot be considered as a metric calculation in isolation given that any impacts are also determined with reference to visual and spatial considerations. As noted in the Planning Statement, it is important to bear in mind the very special circumstance requirement of development in the green belt. These should be balanced against impact on green belt, the quality of design, improvements to the green belt and sustainable development. On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with planning policy and should be allowed.